

## Presentation HL

Marks	Level descriptor
0	The work does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
1–5	There is little or no evaluative interpretation of the extract, displaying a very limited understanding of how meaning is constructed through the use of film language, and a very limited awareness of the extract's relationship to the film as a whole. There is little or no explanation for the selection of the extract. The critique shows little or no awareness of the film's genre and/or its place in a broader sociocultural context. There is little or no analysis of the director's intention. No reference is made to the responses to the film from audiences and reviewers, critics or scholars at the time of its original release and/or subsequently. This presentation is likely to be exclusively descriptive.
6–10	There is a limited evaluative interpretation of the extract, displaying some understanding of how meaning is constructed through the use of film language, and a limited awareness of the extract's relationship to the film as a whole. There is a limited explanation for the selection of the extract. The critique shows some awareness of the film's genre and/or its place in a broader sociocultural context. There is a limited analysis of the director's intention. Limited reference is made to the responses to the film from audiences and reviewers, critics or scholars at the time of its original release and/or subsequently. A substantial amount of the presentation may have detailed descriptions, but offers only limited analysis.
11–15	There is a coherent evaluative interpretation of the extract, displaying an adequate understanding of how meaning is constructed through the use of film language, and a satisfactory awareness of the extract's relationship to the film as a whole. There is an adequate explanation for the selection of the extract. The critique shows a satisfactory awareness of the film's genre and/or its place in a broader sociocultural context. There is some analysis of the director's intention. Some apt reference is made to the responses from audiences and reviewers, critics or scholars at the time of its original release and/or subsequently. There may be some descriptive elements but the presentation offers adequate analysis.
16–20	There is a coherent and detailed evaluative interpretation of the extract, displaying a good understanding of how meaning is constructed through the use of film language, and a good awareness of the extract's relationship to the film as a whole. There is a clear explanation for the selection of the extract. The critique shows a good awareness of the film's genre and/or its place in a broader sociocultural context. There is a sound analysis of the director's intention. Clear reference is made to the responses from audiences and reviewers, critics or scholars at the time of its original release and/or subsequently. There may be brief elements of description but analysis is thorough.
21–25	There is a coherent, incisive and richly detailed evaluative interpretation of the extract, displaying an excellent understanding of how meaning is constructed through the use of film language, with an excellent awareness of the extract's relationship to the film as a whole. There is a persuasive explanation for the selection of the extract. The critique shows an excellent awareness of the film's genre and/or its place in a broader sociocultural context. There is insightful analysis of the director's intention, and examples of responses from audiences and reviewers, critics or scholars at the time of its original release and/or subsequently have been discussed. Simple description is negligible and analysis is clear and thorough.

**Pre-prepared work:** Any student suspected of reading his/her presentation from a prepared script could be in breach of IB diploma regulations and will be considered as a case of academic misconduct.

**Time limit:** Examiners are not required to listen beyond the prescribed time limit of 15 minutes.